

**FY15 User Survey Report: Executive Summary
for the
SC Lattice QCD Computing Project Extension II
(LQCD-ext II)**

Unique Project (Investment) Identifier: 019-20-01-21-02-1032-00

Operated at
Brookhaven National Laboratory
Fermi National Accelerator Laboratory
Thomas Jefferson National Accelerator Facility

for the
U.S. Department of Energy
Office of Science
Offices of High Energy and Nuclear Physics

Version 1.0

May 19, 2016

PREPARED BY:

The LQCD Integrated Project Team

Rob Kennedy, Gerard Bernabeu Altayo, Bill Boroski, Don Holmgren, Paul Mackenzie, Bob Mawhinney, Shigeki Misawa, Frank Quarant, Amitoj Singh, Chip Watson, and Tony Wong

1 Executive Summary

In order to serve the USQCD user community in the best possible manner, anonymous online surveys are conducted on an annual basis by the LQCD-ext II Project to quantify the level of user satisfaction with the services provided by the LQCD computing project facilities. The LQCD-ext II Integrated Project Team (IPT) uses the results of these surveys to identify ways to improve and optimize services using the limited resources available to the project. Annual user surveys have been conducted by the LQCD, LQCD-ext, and LQCD-ext II projects since 2007. This report presents the results of the FY15 LQCD-ext II User Survey.

The FY15 LQCD-ext II User Survey was officially open from November 16, 2015 to January 15, 2015. The survey was designed to measure user satisfaction during the period from October 2014 through September 30, 2015. The online survey consisted of 29 questions designed to measure the level of satisfaction with: (a) the compute facilities operated and managed by the LQCD-ext II project team, and (b) the annual resource allocation process conducted and managed by the USQCD Scientific Program Committee.

The survey was distributed to all scientific members of the USQCD collaboration, with a focus on obtaining a response from USQCD Principal Investigators (PI's) and from the most active users at one of the three host facilities during the year. The FY15 survey was distributed to a total of 201 individuals; of these, responses were received from 66 individuals. 30 out of 35 PI's completed a survey for a response rate of 86%, compared to 74% in FY14. 32 of the 64 most Active Users completed a survey for a response rate of 50%, compared to 50% in FY14.

Questions related to facility operations were designed to quantify the level of satisfaction on a per-site basis. Results were then aggregated to obtain an overall score for the project. Table 1 shows the aggregate scores for the key facility measurement areas over time. The overall satisfaction rating, a KPI defined in the Project Execution Plan, was 97% in FY15, exceeding the target goal of 92%. Satisfaction ratings for Compute Facility Operations in FY15 were about the same as FY14, with a modest improvement perhaps in the area of User Documentation. User comments suggest that while overall satisfaction is very high, some improvement in documentation is sought.

Table 1. Satisfaction Ratings for Compute Facility Operations

Category	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
Overall Satisfaction	82%	91%	96%	81%	87%	93%	94%	97%	97%
User Documentation	78%	92%	81%	73%	81%	89%	90%	88%	93%
User Support	86%	100%	92%	88%	92%	94%	98%	96%	99%
Responsiveness of Site Staff	89%	97%	98%	90%	90%	92%	98%	96%	99%
System Reliability	74%	90%	84%	76%	91%	89%	96%	96%	93%
Ease of Access	73%	74%	77%	76%	83%	92%	91%	91%	93%
Effectiveness of Other Tools	77%	72%	83%	86%	88%	92%	97%	97%	95%

Questions related to the annual allocation process operations were designed to gauge the level of satisfaction with several aspects of the allocation process, from the clarity of the Call for Proposals, through the transparency and fairness of the allocation process, to the extent to which the process maximizes scientific output. Table 2 shows the aggregate scores for the key measurement areas over time. Satisfaction ratings for the Resource Allocation Process in FY15 improved for Overall Satisfaction and were about the same as FY14 for other areas. Users expressed concern over how some allocations went unused while other proposals were turned down for allocations but were ready to run. There were also comments about introducing elections for some members of the Executive Committee and the Scientific Program Committee.

Table 2. Satisfaction Ratings for the Resource Allocation Process

Category	FY07	FY08	FY09	FY10	FY11	FY12	FY13	FY14	FY15
Overall Satisfaction w/Allocation Process	69%	81%	84%	86%	84%	83%	97%	84%	91%
Clarity of Call for Proposals	79%	91%	93%	93%	93%	94%	99%	88%	88%
Transparency of Allocation Process	61%	64%	79%	86%	74%	86%	93%	83%	81%
Fairness of Allocation Process	63%	73%	88%	86%	93%	86%	96%	81%	84%
Proposal Process Helps Maximize Scientific Output	70%	78%	85%	79%	88%	80%	91%	85%	89%